

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the continued acknowledgement of allowable subject matter in claims 10 and 12. Claims 10 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form herein, which should therefore place both of these claims in immediate condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, and “9-14” stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katsumatsu et al. (6,903,901). Applicants initially traverse this rejection because it includes claims 10 and 12 in the rejection, even though the Examiner has expressly stated that these two claims are allowable over Katsumatsu. Correction is warranted. With respect to claims 1-2, 9, 11, and 13-14, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Katsumatsu does not show a difference in positive pressure on either side of the head slider that will increase the roll angle of the head slider, as now more clearly recited in independent claims 1 and 2 of the present invention, as amended.

The Examiner should now see that independent claims 1 and 2 do not merely recite a difference in positive pressure for two different areas of the slider body, as considered by the Examiner, but instead a difference in positive pressure so as to increase a roll angle of the head slider itself. By this emphasis on the roll angle features of the present claims, the present invention is much better distinguished over the cited portions of Katsumatsu. As cited in the rejection, the text portion from Katsumatsu expressly teaches that the slider body 23 keeps the attitude of a constant roll angle β . No portion of the cited

text teaches or suggests that the roll angle is increased, or even decreased, according to the positive pressure on the two air bearing surfaces identified by the Examiner.

The Examiner should also now see that the asserted case for inherency is no longer applicable with respect to the Katsumatsu reference. An increase in the roll angle could not be presumed as an inherent feature, because Katsumatsu expressly teaches a single, constant roll angle when the slider body flies above the surface of the recording medium, as discussed above. For inherency to apply, the asserted features must always be present. In the present case, however, the reference specifically teaches away from any such assumption.

Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims made herien are entirely consistent with the description on page 11 of the present Specification. As described in the Specification, the positive pressure (lift) and the negative pressure both act on the slider body during flight of the head slider. Concurrently, the load from the head suspension (urging force) also acts on the slider body, based on the elasticity of the suspension. Accordingly, the head slider manages to maintain its flight above the magnetic recording medium during rotation of the medium, and at a higher stability established by the balancing of these three forces, namely, the load, the positive pressure, and the negative pressure. (See page 11, lines 4-11 of the present Specification). The cited portion of Katsumatsu, on the other hand, does not relate the roll angle and the positive pressure with the load and the negative pressure.

In fact, it can be seen in Katsumatsu (Fig. 2) that the side rail 39 extending on the right side of the slider is longer than the side rail 39 that extends on the left side of the slider. Accordingly, the structure shown should exert a significant influence upon the

negative pressure that acts on the slider body 23. The negative pressures that act on both the right and the left sides may also be influenced when the load acting on the slider body decreases. The outstanding rejection does not appear to have taken all of these forces into consideration, and Applicants therefore further submit that the rejection is unwarranted, and has been overcome, for these reasons as well.

New claims 15-17 have been added to recite further combinations of the present invention. New claims 15 and 16 depend from independent claim 1, and new claim 17 is an independent claim directed toward an alternative recitation of the head slider of the present invention. Applicants submit that the subject matter of claim 15 is supported in at least lines 9-12 of page 19 of the present Specification. Claim 16 defines how a read/write head element is embedded in the second area of the slider body. Claim 17 defines how a load acting on the slider body from a head suspension in a direction toward the recording medium decreases, a positive pressure of the second area is maintained, and a positive pressure of the first area decreases. Entry, consideration on the merits, and allowance of new claims 15-17 are respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-2 and 9-17, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Josh C. Snider", written over a circular stamp that contains the text "OSHA".

Josh C. Snider

Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

January 16, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
P:\DOCS\2500\68733\B39292.DOC